1	PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP JOHN M. GRENFELL (CA Bar No. 88500)		
2	john.grenfell@pillsburylaw.com JACOB R. SORENSEN (CA Bar No. 209134)		
3	jake.sorensen@pillsburylaw.com FUSAE NARA ( <i>pro hac vice</i> )		
4	fusae.nara@pillsburylaw.com		
5	ANDREW D. LANPHERE (CA Bar No. 191479) andrew.lanphere@pillsburylaw.com		
6	50 Fremont Street San Francisco, CA 94105		
7	Telephone: (415) 983-1000 Facsimile: (415) 983-1200		
8	Attorneys for Defendants SHARP CORPORATION and		
9	SHARP ELECTRONICS CORPORATION		
10			
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
12	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
13	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION		
14			
15	IN RE: TFT-LCD (FLAT PANEL) ANTITRUST LITIGATION	Master File No. 3:07-md-1827 SI MDL No. 1827	
16			
17	This Document Relates To:	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]	
18	Case No. 3:11-cv-711 SI	ORDER EXTENDING SHARP'S TIME TO ANSWER AMENDED	
19	STATE OF NEW YORK, by and through,	COMPLAINT	
20	ERIC T. SCHNEIDERMAN, Attorney General,		
21	Plaintiff,		
22	V.		
23	AU Optronics Corporation, et al.,		
24	Defendants.		
25			
26			
27			
28			

## Case3:07-md-01827-SI Document4204 Filed11/29/11 Page2 of 3

1	WHEREAS plaintiff State of New York filed an Amended Complaint in the above-	
2	captioned case against Defendants AU Optronics Corporation, AU Optronics Corporation	
3	America, Inc., Chi Mei Optoelectronics Corporation, Chi Mei Optoelectronics USA, Inc.,	
4	CMO Japan Co., Ltd., Hitachi, Ltd., Hitachi Displays, Ltd., Hitachi Electronic Devices	
5	(USA), Inc., LG Display Co., Ltd., LG Display America, Inc., Samsung Electronics Co.,	
6	Ltd., Samsung Electronics America, Inc., Samsung Semiconductor, Inc., Sharp	
7	Corporation, Sharp Electronics Corporation, Toshiba Corporation, Toshiba Matsushita	
8	Display Technology Co., Ltd., Toshiba America Information Systems, Inc., and Toshiba	
9	America Electronic Components, Inc. on March 15, 2011, Dkt. no. 2556;	
10	WHEREAS the Court granted in part and denied in part defendants' motion to	
11	dismiss the Amended Complaint on August 9, 2011;	
12	WHEREAS Sharp Corporation and Sharp Electronics Corporation (together,	
13	"Sharp") desire a reasonable amount of time to answer the Amended Complaint;	
14	WHEREAS the Court previously entered Orders extending the time to answer the	
15	Amended Complaint on August 25, 2011, as stipulated by Plaintiff and Sharp, on	
16	September 13, 2011, as stipulated by Plaintiff and Sharp and on October 25, 2011, as	
17	stipulated by Plaintiff and Sharp; and	
18	WHEREAS the requested time modification will not affect any other deadline in	
19	this case.	
20	THEREFORE, the State of New York and Sharp hereby agree that Sharp's deadline	
21	to answer to the Amended Complaint shall be December 15, 2011.	
22	Dated: November 28, 2011	
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

- 1 -

## Case3:07-md-01827-SI Document4204 Filed11/29/11 Page3 of 3

1		ERIC T. SCHNEIDERMAN
2		Attorney General of the State of New York
3		By: /s/ Richard L. Schwartz
3		Richard L. Schwartz Acting Bureau Chief, Antitrust Bureau
4		Amy McFarlane
5		Assistant Attorney General
		Attorneys for Plaintiff 120 Broadway, 26th Floor
6		New York, New York 10271
7		(212) 416-8282 (Phone) (212) 416-6015 (Facsimile)
0		Richard.Schwartz@ag.ny.gov
8 9		Attorneys for Plaintiff State of New York
10		PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
10		JOHN M. GRENFELL
11		JACOB R. SORENSEN
12		FUSAE NARA ANDREW D. LANPHERE
12		50 Fremont Street
13		San Francisco, CA 94105
14		
15		By: /s/ John M. Grenfell
1.0		John M. Grenfell
16		Attorneys for Defendants SHARP CORPORATION
17		and SHARP ELECTRONICS CORPORATION
18	ATTESTATION: Pursuant to Gen	eral Order 45, Part X-B, the filer attests that the
19	concurrence of the other signatory h	ereto has been obtained.
20		
21	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
22		Sugar Mater
23	Dated:11/28/11	Honorable Susan Illston
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		